UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,381	10/25/2005	Marc Vauclair	NL 030430	7934

24737 7590 08/28/2008
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
SHOLEMAN, ABU S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4148	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/554,381	VAUCLAIR, MARC	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ABU SHOLEMAN	4148	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 October 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1,4 and 7* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 October 2005* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The instant application having Application No.10/554381 filed on 10/25/2005 is presented for examination by the examiner.

Oath/Declaration

2. The applicant's oath/declaration has been reviewed by the examiner and is found to conform to the requirements prescribed in 37 C.F.R. 1.63.

Priority

3. As required by M.P.E.P.210.14(c), acknowledgement is made of applicant's claim for priority based on applications filed on April 28, 2003(EPO 03101153.9). And also certified copy and English translation.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to because **Fig4 explanation does not match with Fig4 description in the specification .The disclosed specification at P.P 10 starting line 14 states that if the space is available (yes), a free location is selected** (404). **The drawing shows (404) are selected if no space is available**. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and

where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

5. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

6. As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
(d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
(e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
(f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
    (1) Field of the Invention.
    (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
(g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
(h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
(i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

(j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
(k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
(l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim Objections

7. Claims 1 and 7 have phrases "content" and "content Material" respectively. Those phrases have similar meaning in the context of digital Media; Applicant's disclosure does not identify any distinguishable definition for the two phrases. If the two phrases are meant to refer to the same entity, use of only one phrase is recommended.

8. Claim 4. No period after end of the device status.

Corrective action required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claim 3 recites the limitation "the device" in line 8 and "neighboring devices" in lines 10-11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is compared to claim 1 of application # 10554229 in the following table:

Instant Application 10/554,381	**Copending Application 10/554,229**
Claim 1	**Claim 1**
A method of facilitating access control to	A method of facilitating access control to
content,	content,
The method involving entities each being	The method involving entities each being
identified by a unique identifier,	identified by a unique identifier,
The method further involving revocation of at	The method further involving revocation of at

least one unique identifier, Where a revoked unique identifier is further referred to as revoked identifier, The method comprising maintaining a local revocation list that contains a list of revoked identifiers.	least one unique identifier, Where a revoked unique identifier is further referred to as revoked identifier, The method comprising a local revocation list of entries, each entry representing at least one revoked identifier.
Receiving a new revoked identifier , and Subsequently conditionally updating (306) the local revocation list with the received new revoked identifier.	Claim 2 Receiving (302) a new revoked identifiers(112) Subsequently updating the local revocation list with the generated shorter representation of the received new revoked identifier. Claim 3 Applying the conversion step to the unique identifier, comparing the shorter representation of the unique identifier with the entries in the local revocation list.

Claim 1, 2 and 3 of co-pending publication number 10/554,229 contains every element of **claim 1** of the instant application and as such anticipates **claim 1** of the instant application.

Although, claim 2 of copending application 10/554,229 did not mention about conditionally updating the list, however, the specification discloses about conditionally updating the revocation list (See paragraph 54 of the co-pending application 10/554,229).

"A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or **anticipated by**, the earlier claim. In re Longi, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); In re Berg, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus). " ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

11. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

SOFTWARE PER SE

13. **Claim 10** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed o non-statutory subject matter of software, *per se*. The claim lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. It is clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. It is at best, function descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are non-statutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Merely claiming non-functional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.").

In this case, applicant has claimed a "a computer program product" of the kind set forth characterized in that the computer program product that is implemented by a software language ; this implies that applicant is claiming a system of software, per se, lacking the hardware necessary to realize any of the underlying functionality. Therefore, claim 10 is directed to non-statutory subject matter as computer program, per se, i.e. the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer, which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claim 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Michael S. Pasieka (US 7260715 B1) (hereinafter Pasieka) in view of W.Daniel Hillis (Patent Number: 6028936) (hereinafter Hillis).

As per claim1, **Pasieka discloses** "A method of facilitating access control to content" as (Column 2, line 25-30, to access information in an access control), "the

method involving entities each being identified by a unique identifier" as (Column 2, line 36-40, each entry in method having at least an identifier of a particular one), "the method further involving revocation of at least one unique identifier as (Column 2, line 25-30, A revocation list works in conjunction with a particular entity which has a unique identifier.), "where a revoked unique identifier is further referred to as revoked identifier" as (Column 2, line 39-40, a corresponding revocation flag indicating whether the particular entity has been revoked), " the method comprising maintaining a local revocation list that contains a list of revoked identifiers" as (Column 2, line 25-26, a method for management of revocation list), "receiving a new revoked identifier" as (Column 3, line 42-43, receiving the broadcast revoked identifier), "subsequently conditionally updating the local revocation list with received new revoked identifier" as (Column 2, line 47-54, the contact list may attempts to communicate with the given entity. An entity identifier for the new entity is stored in the contact list if there is sufficient space available in the contact list, and the revocation flag for the new entity is set if that entity is determined to be on the current local revocation list), "characterized in that the method further comprises an admission step including taking a random decision before updating the local revocation list" as (column 2, line55-57, a method of updating a revocation list for the new entity , an existing entry may be selected using a random or pseudo-random process.)

Pasieka does not disclose the decision being either to ignore the received new revoked identifier, or to update the local revocation list with the received new revoked identifier.

However, Hillis discloses "the decision being either to ignore the received new revoked identifier, or to update the local revocation list with the received new revoked identifier." As (Column 7, line 25-30, a method of making a decision on identifier by checking whether an identifier is already stored in a list before updating the identifier. if an identifier is in the list, then it will ignore or otherwise it will update)

Pasieka (US 7260715 B1) and Hillis (Patent Number: 6028936) are analogous arts because they are the same field of endeavor of updating a revocation list.

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pasieka regarding a random decision to update a list to include information that taught by Hillis because it would provide the purpose of avoiding storage of duplicate identifiers (column 7 line 25-30).

16. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Michael S. Pasieka (US 7260715 B1) (hereinafter Pasieka) in view of W.Daniel Hillis (Patent Number: 6028936) (hereinafter Hillis) and further in view of Diehl et al (US 2005/0021942 A1) (hereinafter Diehl)

As per claim2, **Pasieka and Hillis fail to expressly disclose** "where in a verification step is executed in which a unique identifier is verified by comparing the unique identifier with the revoked identifiers in the local revocation list,"

However, Diehl teaches" wherein a verification step is executed in which a unique identifier is verified by comparing the unique identifier with the revoked identifiers in the local revocation list, "as (Paragraph 0014, Comparing the received identifier with a revocation list identifier). And "the unique identifier is considered to be revoked when the comparison finds a match between the unique identifier and one of the revoked identifiers in the local revocation list" as (paragraph 0014, characterized in that a unique identifier is a revoked item is allotted to each update of the revocation list.)

Diehl (US 2005/0021942 A1), Pasieka (US 7260715 B1) and Hillis (Patent Number: 6028936) are analogous arts because they are same field of endeavor of updating a revocation list.

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pasieka in view of Hillis to include comparing the unique identifier with the revocation list that taught by Diehl because it would provide to determine of the most recent revocation list (Paragraph 0015 line 1-2).

As per Claim 3, **Pasieka, Hillis and Diehl teaches** , "wherein the unique identifier being verified is stored in a list of verified unique identifier "as (Diehl, Column 2 , line 50-51, an entity identifier for the new entity is stored in the contact list), and "the random decision in the admission step has a probability depending on a match of the new received revoked identifier with one of the list of verified unique identifiers" as (See

Hillis , column 7, line 25-30, a method of checking an identifier in the list or it is already in the list.)

As per Claim 4, **Hillis discloses** "Characteristics of the received new revoked identifier " as (Column 7, line 10-15 ,that each identifier assigned a weighted value which identify as a longer identifier.)

As per Claim 5, **Hillis discloses** "a revoked identifier from the local revocation list which is going to be replaces is chosen randomly from the local revocation list " as (Column 6, line 60-62, that updating the stored list is to randomly replace previously stored identifiers with new identifiers.)

As per Claim 6, **Hillis discloses "** the matching identifier is excluded from replacement during the selection step" as (Column 7, line 25-30, that the selection step by checking whether an identifier is already stored in the list before updating the list, if this identifier is in the list, then avoid for replacement for storage.)

As per Claim 9, **Pasieka teaches** " A device arrange to store and maintain a local revocation list that contains a list of revoked identifiers" as (Column 4 line 33-38 the local revocation list is maintained within an electronic memory or other storage device associated with the access control system and the nature of the receiver will generally depend upon the type of broadcast used to supply the revoked identifiers), "to receive a new revoked identifier" as (Column 3, line 42-43, a receiver configured to receive a revoked identifier) , "the device is arrange to take a random decision upon

receiving the new revoked identifier either to update the local revocation list with the received new revoked identifier" as (column 2, line 55-57, a method of updating a revocation list for the new entity , an existing entry may be selected using a random or pseudo-random process.)

Pasieka does not specifically teach the device is arranged to take a random decision upon receiving the new revoked identifier either to ignore the received new revoked identifier.

However, Hillis discloses " the device is arrange to take a random decision upon receiving the new revoked identifier either to ignore the received new revoked identifier" as (Column 6 line 59 - Column 7 line 2, a system of device that updating the stored list randomly, a system that authenticates an identifier by matching with a stored list to avoid storage of duplicate identifiers, and it will ignore the identifier randomly to update a list.)

Pasieka (US 7260715 B1) and Hillis (patent number: 6028936) are analogous arts because they are the same field of endeavor of maintaining a local revocation list with a unique identifier and storage an authenticated item in the list.

Therefore , it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pasieka to include the randomness of the replacement of a identifier of lists that taught by Hillis because it

would provide the advantage that users are unlikely to be able to determine what identifiers are stored in the list (Column 6, line 57-58).

As per Claim 10, **Pasieka teaches** "A method of facilitating access control to content the method involving entities each being identified by a unique identifier, the method further involving of the least one unique identifier, where a revoked unique identifier is further referred to as revoked identifier, the method comprising maintaining a local revocation list that contains a list of revoked identifiers, receiving a new revoked identifier, and subsequently conditionally updating the local revocation list with the received new revoked identifier" as (Column 7, line 23-25, the above claimed described in the fig 4 and fig 5 where the revocation list maintenance operation can be implemented at least in part in the form of one or more software program configured to execution using a conventional processor), "a random decision before updating the local revocation list, the decision to update the local revocation list with the received new revoked identifier" as (column 2, line 55-57, a method of updating a revocation list for the new entity , an existing entry may be selected using a random or pseudo-random process.)

Pasieka does not specifically teach a random decision before updating the local revocation list, the decision being either to ignore the received new revoked identifier.

However, Hillis discloses "the decision being either to ignore the received new revoked identifier, or to update the local revocation list with the received new revoked identifier " as (Column 7, line 25-30, that updating the stored list is to randomly replace previously stored identifiers with new identifiers. In addition, it has an authentic module which authenticates an identifier base on the stored list that should be avoid for a storage.)

Pasieka (US 7260715 B1) and Hillis (patent number: 6028936) are analogous arts because they are the same field of endeavor of a computer program product that update a local revocation list.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of implementing a contact list with a revoked flag of entity by Pasieka to include checking a revoked identifier to ignore or update a list that taught by Hillis because it would avoid updating a duplicate identifier in the list (Column 7 line 29-30).

17. Claim 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Michael A. Epstein(W0 01/11819 A1) (hereinafter Epstein) in view of Hillis(Patent Number: 6028936).

As per claim 7, **Epstein teaches** "A system for controlling access to content material" as (Column 4, line 6-8, The access control system provides accessed content material), ' the system comprising a local revocation list that contains a list of revoked

identifier" as (Column 5, line 15-16, the local revocation list will be filled with the received revoked identifier), " a receiver for receiving a new revoked identifier(Column 5, line 12-13, the receiver receives the revoked identifiers) and an updater for conditionally updating the local revocation list with the received new revoked identifier" as (Column 5, line 17-18, the replacer is acting as a updater which is configured to randomly replace a previous entry in the list with each received revoked identifier),

Epstein does not specifically teach "characterized in that the system further comprises an admission device arranged to take a random decision either to ignore the received new revoked identifier, or to update the local revocation list with the received new revoked identifier".

However, Hillis discloses "device arranged to take a random decision either to ignore the received new revoked identifier, or to update the local revocation list with the received new revoked identifier" as (Column 7, line 20-30, a storage management system checking whether an identifier is already stored in a list or not. If an identifier is on the list it would avoid a replacement or otherwise it will update a list randomly.)

Epstein (WO 01/11819 A1) and Hillis (patent number: 6028936) are analogous arts because they are the same field of endeavor of a system for controlling access to content material comprising a receiver of a revoked identifier or a replacer to replace a revoked identifier and a local revocation list.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Epstein by including information that taught by Hillis because it would provide that the hackers or users will not be able to determine what identifiers are stored in the list or unit (column 6 line 65-69).

As per claim 8, **Epstein discloses** " an access device for controlling access to content material" as (Column 4, line 5-10, The access control system Provides accessed content material), "the access device being identified by a unique identifier" as (Column 4, line 23-25, The access identifier is a unique identifier), "the access of access device to the content material is not being allowed if a match is found between the unique identifier of the access device, and an entry in the local revocation list" as (Column 7, line 10-15 An access control system checks the validity of the access identifier and if the access identifier matches an entry in the local list of revoked identifies).

Conclusion

18. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is cited to establish the level of skill in the application's art and those arts considered reasonably pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See MPEP 707.05(c).

19. The following reference teaches execution of trial data

US 6748531 B1

US 2004/0243827

US 2005/0055548 A1

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abu Sholeman whose telephone number is (571) 270-7314 . The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the above noted Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor Thomas Pham can be reached at the following telephone number: (571) 272-3689.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

July 31, 2008

Abu Sholeman
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 4148

/THOMAS K PHAM/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4148